DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 317 HE 025 102

AUTHOR Lafer, Mark
TITLE Race, A Variable Construct in Introductory Textbooks for Select Social Sciences Curricula in Contemporary American Undergraduate Education. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE 31 Oct 91
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Boston, MA, October 31-November 3, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Curriculum; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; Higher Education; *Introductory Courses; Literature Reviews; *Race; *Racial Attitudes; Social Sciences; *Textbook Bias; *Textbook Research; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the inclusion of race, both as a construct and as an issue, in the introductory level of the college social science curriculum. First, a review of the literature concerning the general higher education curriculum indicates that a general education should prepare students for citizenship. Next, the paper presents evidence that race remains a significant civil issue within American society. Finally, a sample of what currently constitutes the text-based content of the introductory social science curriculum of race within anthropology, psychology, and sociology in the context of current biological thought is discussed. The sample review of these textbooks, shows that the textbooks may be legitimately organized into four categories based on how race is handled: (1) ignores the issue of race as a construct; (2) presents a confused or inconsistent interpretation of race; (3) supports a biological construction for race; and (4) supports a sociological interpretation, while denying the validity of the biological construction. It is suggested that the implications of these results extend beyond how textbooks are written and, depending on how academia constructs race, implies a corresponding impact on how colleges and universities operate. Contains 60 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED339317

RACE

A Variable Construct in Introductory Textbooks

for Select Social Sciences Curricula

in Contemporary American Undergraduate Education

Mark Lafer
Undergraduate Admissions Office
221 Shields Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-0825
BITNET: mxl4@psuvm

Paper presented at the
Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Study of Higher Education
Boston, MA
October 31, 1991

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mark Lafer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 025 102

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Park Plaza Hotel & Towers in Boston, Massachusetts, October 31-November 3, 1991. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Introduction

Introductory college courses in the social sciences provide a nexus between students and many of the personal and social issues Americans can expect to confront during their lives. Significantly, large numbers of undergraduate students may receive their only formal exposure to many concepts and issues through a single course in anthropology, psychology, or sociology, although actual numbers cannot be confirmed at this time. (The three pertinent national professional associations report that they do not maintain statistics on introductory versus upper level course taking patterns (American Anthropological Association, 1991; American Psychological Association, 1991; American Sociological Association; 1991).)

As potentially unique sources of authoritative information on content area issues and ideas for participating students, these introductory courses can be expected to have a meaningful impact on how these students organize or modify their cognitive schemata for topics covered. To the extent that the textbooks used in these courses serve as sources of information for this cognitive processing, both academia and the community have a legitimate interest in textbook content and the right (and possibly the duty) to pursue three concerns: (a) Does an individual topic belong in an introductory text for this area of the curriculum? (b) Does the content of such a text agree with the prevailing conception of truth among experts on the topic - and, if not, are such differences overtly discussed? (c) Does the text present the topic in a manner accessible to the intended audience? (Bronstein & Quina, 1988; Stocking, 1982; Villars, 1988.)

For the undergraduate curriculum, the topic of race can arouse these concerns. Race persists as a pervasive, problematic, and controversial construct, or operational concept, within both American higher education and society at large. It similarly persists as a social issue. This bifurcation of the topic--into construct and issue--has significance.

Many academic and most public discussions of race treat associated issues as if debate

on the validity of the construct has already been resolved in the affirmative. As a result, in addressing racially tinged issues, we rarely ask the difficult fundamental question: if race lacks validity as a construct, how should we think and act as individuals and as a society about these issues; and as educators, what steps should we and can we take to eliminate existing misunderstandings? Is the undergraduate curriculum an appropriate venue?

Merely to claim that a confused understanding persists in the public eye does not sufficiently justify including race as a topic for introductory courses in general, or the social sciences specifically. I will, therefore, address several lines of inquiry that, taken together, support the inclusion of race, both as a construct and as an issue, in the introductory level of the social science curriculum. First I will review some of the literature from the present debate over the general higher education curriculum that argues that a general education should prepare students for citizenship. I will then present evidence that race remains a significant civil issue within American society. Finally I will discuss a sample of what currently constitutes the text-based content of the introductory social science curriculum of race within anthropology, psychology, and sociology in the context of current biological thought.

Race: Appropriate for the Curriculum?

Big State University publicly announces a plan for diversity. This includes a call that the curriculum should open students' minds for "...integration into a multicultural society" (Livingston, 1991). While such proposals may make no direct reference to the term, contemporary discussions in the literature of the college curriculum make it clear that the concept of diversity subsumes that of race (Bronstein & Quina, 1988; Stocking, 1982; Villars, 1988).

An examination of the literature on the nature of race across broad disciplinary areas as

varied as the humanities (McNeill, 1990), the natural sciences (Diop, 1983; King, 1981; Weingart, 1989), and the social sciences (Banton, 1987; Heilke, 1990; Stocking, 1982) similarly reveals that the idea of race already leads a lively, widespread existence within the general scope of the contemporary American college curriculum. **De facto** inclusion does not necessarily constitute validation; however, the debate over the need to reconstruct the undergraduate curriculum does provide a forum in which its inclusion (and what form this would take) can be debated.

Preparation for citizenship has recurred as a documented theme in the debate over the proper content of higher education since the 5th century, BCE, Athenian city state. In The Republic (Cornford, 1945), Plato presents Socrates's case that the brightest of the young among the citizens of the state should receive an education that has as its ultimate goal preparation for civic leadership. Conversely, In Apology: Socrates at his Trial (Plato, 1960), Socrates confronts charges that he has corrupted the youth of Athens, by teaching them to question all things, including civil authority.

Much more recently, published discussions of the content and purpose of the college curriculum in the United States have addressed citizenship issues. In 1984, both William Bennett (1984) and the National Institute of Education Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (NIE) (1984) released final reports on publicly funded studies of college education. Both contain calls for citizenship concerns to be included in the curriculum: Bennett refers to the need to prepare students to live in society; and NIE, to education for citizenship. Boyer (1987), in his Carnegie Foundation supported examination of American undergraduate education reiterates the phrasing of NIE--education for citizenship. Hirsch (1987), while advocating the restoration of higher education for cultural literacy retains a civic orientation: that education should prepare the student to participate in public and political discourse. Finally, Kimball (1988), in his review of the recent critical literature of the current college curriculum--

including the preceding four publications, points out that all share the common thread, an emphasis a role for colleges in the preparation of good citizens.

Within the American republic, issues of law, public policy, and the general welfare, together with educational curricula, define citizenship concerns. Therefore, if race has a role in these aspects of national life, race becomes a citizen issue. Support abounds for this claim.

Race has legal consequences. Race receives direct mention in the third of the founding documents of the American republic, the Bill of Rights: "The rights of citizens of the United states to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude" (U.S., Constitution, Amend XV, sec. 1). The Civil Rights Act of 1964 devotes extensive attention to considerations of race in (among other issues) the appropriation and use of public funds (Title VI, 42 U.S.C. 2000(d) et seq.) and hiring practices (Title VII, 42 U.S.C. 2000(e) et seq.). A series of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court since 1954 have made it clear that race may not be used to discriminate against individuals in education and other public venues, including: Bakke wins..., (1978, July); Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (1954); Defunis v. Odegaard (1974); Moose Lodge 107 v. Irvis (1972); and Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 1978).

Race has public policy consequences outside the legal arena. Claims that race should be a factor in developing public educational strategies at all levels have readily found constituencies on both sides of the town and gown line, as have few other racially tinged issues. In particular Jensen (1969)--along with his respondents (e.g., Dorfman, 1978)--crystallizes the curricular concerns of the final section of this paper: his argument that race has a biologically deterministic impact on intelligence has become a staple among race referencing introductory social science textbooks currently in use.

Jensen claims that race has a causal link to expressed IQ--taken as a valid measure of

underlying mental capacities--and that educational practices should be structured to take this relationship into consideration. In this process Jensen treats race as a valid biological construct and proceeds to form his response to educational issues with important racial consequences as a direct extension of this construction.

Finally, large scale public disturbances represent a direct threat to the public welfare and clearly constitute an issue of civic concern. When those charged with reporting on such incidents to the citizenry, such as the members of the Kerner Commission, present their findings in a manner that emphasizes a racial component to the events, no one can divorce race from those issues demanding informed public discourse (U.S. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968).

The Proper Presentation of Race

If a topic can gain entry to the higher education curriculum by demonstrating civic importance, race appears to qualify. The discussion can therefore move on to confront directly the issues: (a) Does it matter how race is presented in introductory social science textbooks; (b) what is race; and (c) how do our texts present this information.

(a) How textbooks present race makes a difference. Any element of the curriculum that discusses race may be the only formal educational encounter with this idea for an individual student. Therefore, to the extent that formal education provides the knowledge base for future decision making, individual judgments about race will be shaped by the curriculum. How textbooks for introductory social science courses present race may matter even more. Although the numbers are not precisely known, more American undergraduates probably get their academic exposure to race in basic anthropology, psychology, and sociology courses than in any

other comparable subset of the curriculum. For many of these students, a single introductory course in one of these disciplines may constitute the only formal exposure they receive.

(b) The term race creates confusion. Stocking (1982) places the blame for this state at the door of anthropology. He argues that the origins of the discipline arose from 18th and 19th century attempts to reconcile observed cultural diversity with the emergent understanding of the biological unity of humans as a species. From his discussion, we can see race emerge as a compromise that allows for the observed phenotype diversity of humans in the absence of evidence for true speciation.

Heilke (1990) makes a similar argument. The topic of discourse on race and anthropology are the same. However, this unity has not produced a viable construct. Anthropology has attempted to develop a model of on-going speciation in homo sapiens to account for cultural differences. The discipline has not, however, based its paradigm of race on rigorous empirical work, nor has it established a precise research methodology for delimiting the racial groups identified by the paradigm.

Banton (1987) in his review of the evolution of the race concept continues this pattern. In addition to tracing the changes in the understanding of the term since it entered the English language in 1508, he discusses the confusion of covariate and causal issues. He specifically focuses attention on the flaw of applying biological, evolutionary--racial--theory to account for the empirical link between physical and behavioral differences among individuals in different cultures. Finally he refers to alternate, social paradigms that also provide explanations for these observations.

Weingart (1989) makes two points. He confirms that anthropology prior to World War II provides, at best, a confused concept of race. He also makes clear that the failure to challenge the flaws in a race-is-biology paradigm supports a range of public policies that can have far-

ranging consequences. In some cultures and societies, such as Nazi Germany, these have included extreme sanctions against members of racial minorities: the promulgation of laws against inter-racial marriage, forced sterilization, mass relocation, enslavement, and extermination.

Psychology shares some of the blame for the confusion, at least within the context of the study of intelligence. The pioneering work of Cyril Burt on the genetic contribution of expressed human intelligence has supported a curious set of conclusions by Jensen (1969): (a) Groups that exhibit statistically different mean IQ scores are from genetically different populations; (b) American blacks, in comparison to American whites, demonstrate such a difference; and, therefore, (c) blacks are a separate biological race.

Furthermore Jensen argues that differences in intelligence that have a genetic basis cannot be affected by environmental factors. Consequently implementing social policies with the expectation that they will remedy group IQ score differences represents an exercise in futility. However, Jensen's work contains a fatal flaw.

Dorfman s work (1978)--and a summary of the controversy in Atkinson, et al., (1990)--demonstrates that Jensen's line of reasoning lacks a valid base. Dorfman does not refute the empirical evidence cited by Jensen which shows statistically significant group differences between the IQ scores of American whites and blacks. He does, however, present evidence that the research of Cyril Burt was a total forgery. Thus, with the basis for Jensen's claim that genetics are the principle determinant of intelligence in humans discredited, his logical extension of this conclusion to the realm of social policy becomes untenable.

Diop (1983), King (1981), and Villars (1988) explicitly state that race has no basis in human biology. "In applying the name Homo Sapiens to all human populations, Linnaeus recognized that they constituted a single species, and **scarcely any serious students have ever dissented since** [emphasis added]....What constitutes a race is a matter of social definition"

(King, 1981, pp. 135, 155).

Diop (1983) argues that the data make it clear that humans are monogenetic. They frequently exhibit greater genetic variation within phenotypic groups than one observes between such groups: a white Afrikaaner may be genetically closer to a black Zulu than to a white Swede.

Villars (1988) states that the biological data do not support hereditarian race theories. She also makes an additional, important point: "Such a sophisticated understanding [of such theories] requires more effort on the part of both student and teacher" (p. 83).

In summary, the term race creates confusion two ways. We have come to use an anthropological construct for classifying individuals into discrete groups on the basis of appearance as if it also has validity as a genetic construct (Banton, 1987; Heilke, 1990; Stocking, 1982; Weingart, 1989). We have within American culture established law and public policy at times as if race were genetic (Bakke wins..., 1978, July; Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 1954; Defunis v. Odegaard, 1974; Moose Lodge 107 v. Irvis, 1972; Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 1978; Title VI, 42 U.S.C. 2000(d) et seq.; Title VII, 42 U.S.C. 2000(e) et seq.; U.S., Constitution, Amend XV, sec. 1). At other times, however, we have challenged hereditarian race in areas of social action (Dorfman, 1978; Jensen, 1969).

(c) Do textbooks for the introductory courses in anthropology, psychology, and sociology present race effectively and consistently? Villar's (1988) comments suggest that they will fall somewhat short of successfully meeting both criteria.

The remainder of this study presents the results of a qualitative review of 28 textbooks currently available for use in introductory level course in anthropology, psychology, and sociology, building on a suggestion of Villars (1988). She believes that an adequate understanding of race can be achieved in the undergraduate social sciences curriculum, although this may require considerable effort from participants in the educational process. If the textbook authors have

made the requisite effort, one obstacle to effective understanding has been eliminated.

Method

The review uses a modified annotated bibliographic approach to create a summary of the following qualitative characteristics of each text used:

1. Does the text specifically identify race as a topic? A text meets this criterion if race appears as an index heading, if the term is defined in the glossary (if one exists), or if it is overtly discussed in the context of genetics, heredity, or intelligence/IQ.

1a. If the texts does specifically identify race as a topic, does the content accurately reflect the position of biology that race is a social, not a scientific, construct?

2. Does the text present a discussion of human genetics that supports the current biological interpretation of race?

3. Does the text present a discussion of human hereditability of characteristics that supports the current biological interpretation of race?

4. Does the text present a discussion of the relationship between human intelligence and race that supports the current biological interpretation of race?

The social science curriculum, for the purposes of this study, has been restricted to the fields of anthropology, psychology, and sociology. Theodorson & Theodorson (1990) suggest that these fields have demonstrated both an interest in, and an understanding of the biological position on the meaning of race.

The selection of specific texts reflects only the level of reviewer access to introductory books currently in use for these fields: both the publishers and faculty contacted have shown variability in their willingness to provide texts on a permanent or temporary basis. Therefore, I

cannot claim either that my sample begins to exhaust the possible set of texts available or that it is representative of those in use by any specific criterion. None of those I have received have been omitted, however.

Each review follows a standard format. They are ordered alphabetically by discipline label and, within each discipline, alphabetically by author. Seven reviews profile introductory texts for anthropology courses, 12 for psychology, and 9 for sociology. All emphasis in the quotations cited reflects the authors' texts. A summary of the findings follows the reviews.

Results and Discussion

Anthropology textbooks

Author: Bates & Plog. (1990).

Title: Cultural anthropology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): Y. "**ethnicity** a basis for social categories that are rooted in socially perceived differences in national origin, language, and/or religion" (p. 437).

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: N

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: N

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The discussion makes no reference to a biological basis for a racial classification schema.

Author: Crapo. (1990).

Title: Cultural anthropology: Understanding ourselves & others.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N.

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: Y

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: N

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The texts fails to confront the issue directly. The author only discusses the role of anthropology in the development of the 18th century racial classification schema based on phenotypes.

Author: Ember & Ember. (1988).

Title: Anthropology

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): Y. "**Race** a subpopulation or variety of a single species that differs somewhat in gene frequencies from other varieties of the species but can interbreed with them and produce fertile and viable offspring" (p. 496).

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: Y

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: Overall, the authors make an inconsistent presentation. As opposed to their glossary definition, in the body of the text they state, for example, that "...many [anthropologists] would argue that the concept of race is not particularly useful scientifically. Racial categories hardly ever correspond to the variations in human biology we want to explain..." (p. 120).

Author: Jurmain, et al. (1990)

Title: Understanding physical anthropology and archeology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): Y. "**Race** Currently defined by anthropologists as a breeding population; formerly applied to a group of people who resembled each other in physical appearance. Many anthropologists do not believe the term to be a useful one when applied to humans" (p. 612).

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: Y

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: As in the glossary, the authors fail to make a consistent presentation within the body of the text. In the Cyril Burt/Arthur Jensen controversy they take the position that race lacks value in considerations of intelligence (pp. 105-105). Later, they state that even population geneticists cannot fully dismiss the explanatory power of race in studies of genetic diversity (pp. 117-119).

Author: Kottack. (1991).

Title: Cultural anthropology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): Y. "**race, biological**: Problematic concept; in theory, a biologically discrete group whose members share certain distinctive traits inherited from a common ancestry" (p. 65).

"**race, social**: a group assumed to have some biological basis but actually perceived and defined in a social context--by a particular culture rather than by scientific criteria" (pp. 64-65).

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: Y

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: Kottack makes a complex, comprehensive presentation of the concept. He clearly takes the position that race has meaning only as a social construct, and that the biological construct lacks validity.

Author: Peoples & Bailey. (1991).

Title: Humanity: An introduction to cultural anthropology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N):** Y

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N):** N

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The authors' discussion leans predominantly toward the position that race is a social, not a biological, construct. However, they do include comments that preclude classifying this text as having an unequivocal position, such as: "...diversity in customs and beliefs...are **rarely** explained by biological/genetic differences and alterations" (p. 34).

Author: Schultz & Lavenda. (1990).

Title: Cultural anthropology: A perspective on the human condition.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): Y "**race** a social grouping based on perceived physical differences and described in the idiom of biology" (p. 344).

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N):** Y

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N):** Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The text provides a generally clear, although limited, presentation of the change in interpretation of race, from a biological to a social construct for the classification of humans. The glossary definition probably represents the weakest statement of their position. Their comments on page 7 better typify their views: "The concept of 'race,' therefore, does not reflect a fact of nature but instead is a label invented by human beings that permits us to sort people into groups."

Psychology textbooks

Author: Atkinson, et al. (1990).

Title: Introduction to psychology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): N **of genetics (Y/N)**: Y

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The authors do not formally present a discrete discussion of race. They do, however, directly challenge the validity of the term as a biological construct in their detailed discussion of the biological and environmental determinants of expressed intelligence in humans. "Although blacks and whites may differ in physical appearance, they do not represent two distinct biological groups. In fact differences in gene structure (where known) in most cases are greater **within** the races than between them" (p. 468).

Author: Buskist & Gerbing. (1990).

Title: Psychology: Boundaries and frontiers.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): N **of genetics (Y/N)**: Y

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: Race receives little attention in this volume. The authors' even present the nature/nurture debate, within the study of expressed IQ, as one involving comparisons of ethnically labelled African-Americans to whites--neither an ethnic nor a standard racial label.

Author: Crooks, et al. (1991).

Title: Psychology: Science, behavior, and life.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N):** Y

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N):** Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The authors do not address the issue of the underlying nature of race, even in their discussion of race and intelligence.

Author: Dworetzky. (1991).

Title: Psychology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N):** N

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N):** Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: Dworetzky does not directly invoke the construct. The issue of race appears only as a peripheral concern in the material on the debate over the hereditability of IQ. The term race is never actually used. Instead, the text compares whites and blacks.

Author: Feldman. (1990).

Title: Understanding psychology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N):** Y

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N):** Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: Feldman shows a stronger hereditarian emphasis than others in discussing the bases of human behavior, but still

ignores the question of the nature of race. He only considers it briefly, in his material on intelligence: "The evidence that genetic factors play a major role in determining racial differences in IQ...is not compelling--although the question still evokes controversy..." (p. 285).

Author: Lahey. (1989).

Title: Psychology: An introduction.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: Y

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: Lahey offers no discussion of the topic of race beyond presenting material that indicates that he sees inter-racial differences in IQ scores as attributable to environmental, not genetic effects (pp. 282-283).

Author: Ornstein & Carstensen. (1991).

Title: Psychology: The study of human experience.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: Y

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The authors stop short of denying race construct validity. They do make it clear, in their material on intelligence, that they do not find race a particularly useful term for the categorization of humans. "In truth the major characteristic differences between races are skin deep.... There is no evidence of differences between races in brain size, shape, organization, or structure....There are many times more differences among individuals within a racial group than there are among group averages"

(p. 386).

Author: Roediger, et al. (1991)

Title: Psychology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: Y

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The writers present an extended discussion of racial classification as a factor in the debate over the nature of IQ sparked by Jensen. They, fail, however, to address the proper interpretation or validity of the construct.

Author: Sdorow. (1990).

Title: Psychology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): N **of genetics (Y/N)**: N

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: Sdorow only discusses race briefly in his section on the on-going controversy over bias in intelligence testing. His text material denies an hereditary basis for the statistical association between race and intelligence as measured by standard tests, but does not go beyond this (pp. 314-318).

Author: Wallace, et al. (1990).

Title: Introduction to psychology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): N **of genetics (Y/N):** Y

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N):** Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The authors do not provide any discussion of the nature of race. They omit this even in the material they present on the legal and social implications of the contemporary race and intelligence testing controversy (pp. 246-247).

Author: Weiten. (1989).

Title: Psychology: Themes and variations.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): N **of genetics (Y/N):** Y

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N):** Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: Weiten never uses the term. Even in his discussion of the nature/nurture debate over the nature of human intelligence, his phrasing avoids it: "Taken together, the various rebuttals of Jensen's views provide serious challenges to his theory. Genetic explanations for **ethnic** [emphasis added] differences in IQ appear weak at best and suspiciously racist at worst" (p. 327).

Author: Wortman, et al. (1988).

Title: Psychology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): N **of genetics (Y/N):** Y

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N):** Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The authors fail to address directly the nature of race. They confine their discussion of it to a brief comment in the material they present that indicates the failure of research to demonstrate an hereditary linkage between race and intelligence as measured by IQ test scores (p. 389).

Sociology textbooks

Author: Coser, et al. (1983)

Title: Introduction to sociology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): Y "**Race**. People showing genetically inherited characteristics who are thought of as a distinctive group and regard themselves as such" (p. 517).

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: N

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: N

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The authors spend little time on the concept. Their definition makes it clear that they accept the validity of race as a biological construct. Only in their statement "Biologically, the concept of race is unimportant" (p. 214) do they avoid being labelled as biological determinists.

Author: Hess, et al. (1991).

Title: Sociology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): Y "**Race** is a social construction; there are no 'pure' racial types" (p. 619).

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: N

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: Hess and her co-

authors take a clear position that biology does not determine race. Instead they propose that members of supposed racial groups "...vary tremendously in genotype, phenotype, and cultural backgrounds" (p. 251).

Author: Inciardi & Rothman. (1990).

Title: Sociology: Principles and applications.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): Y "**race** An ascribed status defined on the basis of visible physical characteristics" (G-9).

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: N

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The text presents a consistent, clear, and strongly worded refutation of race as a valid biological concept. The discussion of the term emphasizes its arbitrary nature. "It is a mistake to look to biology or genetics to understand the concept of race, for the concept originated as, and continues to be primarily based on an arbitrary set of features typically chosen to suit the purposes and convenience of the labeler" (pp. 257-258).

Author: Larson, et al. (1989).

Title: Introductory sociology: Order and change in society.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): N

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: N

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: N

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The authors have a clear biological orientation to the issue of race. In their definition they state: "**Physically**

identifiable populations are called races or racial groups. A more elaborate definition of race would include: a relatively self-sufficient people, inbreeding over a very long period of time a set of physical characteristics--particularly visible ones--that are found with far greater frequency and intensity within the population than outside it" (p. 333).

Author: Macionis. (1991)

Title: Sociology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): Y "**race** a category composed of men and women who share biologically transmitted traits that are defined as socially significant" (p. 640).

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: N

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: Macionis treats the subject of race superficially and inconsistently. While the text clearly accepts a biological basis for race in the glossary and at other points, its treatment of the construct on page 336 obscures this position: "Race is a matter of biological traits. The traditional distinctions among Caucasians, Negroids, and Mongoloids have been undermined by the fact that there are no pure races."

Author: Stark. (1987).

Title: Sociology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): Y "**Race** A human group having some biological features that set it off from other human groups" (p. 615).

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: Y

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: Stark takes a clear race-as-biology position. However, his presentation sometimes makes him sound like an apologist for the reality he supports. "Although race is a biological concept, racial differences are important for intergroup relations only to the extent that people attach cultural meaning to them.... Biological differences may be unchangeable, but by themselves they are not important. It is what we believe about these differences that matter" (p. 279).

Author: Theodorson & Theodorson. (1990).

Title: Sociology: Principles and applications.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): Y "**Race** A conceptual subdivision of the human species, in which certain arbitrarily selected physical characteristics occur in greater or lesser proportion than in other subdivisions" (p. 599).

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N)**: N

of heredity (Y/N): Y **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N)**: N

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: The authors provide a brief, but strongly stated refutation of the biological interpretation of the concept. They state, in part: "Studies in sociology, anthropology, and psychology demonstrated quite clearly that race is not linked to biological potential or mental aptitude....Race, then, is not useful as a scientific concept in the physical classification of human beings" (p. 260).

Author: Vander Zanden. (1990).

Title: Sociology: The core.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): Y "**race** Populations that differ in the incidence of various hereditary traits" (p. 188).

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N):** N

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N):** N

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: Vander Zanden fails to take a consistent position. The text presentation seems overall to favor a biological interpretation; but it offers a sufficient quantity of qualifying conditions and statements that the student is likely to come away confused.

Author: Wallace & Wallace (1989)

Title: Sociology.

Glossary entry for race (Y/N): Y "**race** a population that shows visible physical characteristics from inbreeding and thinks of itself or is thought of by outsiders as genetically distinct" (p. 277).

Discussion of race (Y/N): Y **of genetics (Y/N):** Y

of heredity (Y/N): N **of intelligence/IQ (Y/N):** Y

Summary and categorization of the presentation of the construct of race: Wallace and Wallace offer a potentially confusing series of comments on the underlying nature of race, while recognizing the implications of the nature of race for social policy. In the glossary definition and their in text discussion, they intertwine both the biological concept of inbreeding and a social, ascriptive basis for the idea of race.

Summary

Villars (1988) warns us that to address the concept of race effectively requires hard work. If we define an effective presentation as one that incorporates the current biological view of the construct, then the evidence from this textbook review shows that not all of the authors examined

have worked hard enough.

An overview of the comments from the qualitative analysis suggests that the books may be legitimately organized into four categories for summary purposes: (a) ignores the issue of race as a construct, (b) presents a confused or inconsistent interpretation of race, (c) supports a biological construction for race, and (d) supports a sociological interpretation, while denying the validity of the biological construction.

The application of this organizational scheme to the results makes it clear that there exists substantial within and between discipline variations in the treatment of race. The following table offers an overview.

[Place Table here, p. 32]

Cell totals of the order of magnitude found in the table offer little opportunity or justification for sophisticated statistical analysis. A chi-square analysis does attain significance, however. Therefore certain aspects of the observed distribution do justify and invite comment.

In particular, under the system of text categorization used, the biological construction receives no support, except from sociologists: support for this position occurs in 3 of the 9 texts reviewed (Coser, et al., 1983; Larson, et al., 1989; Stark, 1987). Finally, texts supporting the antipodal position--race as a social construct--have a better than 2:1 superiority; and these tend to articulate their arguments in relatively stronger terms.

Psychology texts typically shy away from the controversy: 10 of the 12 essentially ignore the issue; and these 10 represent 83.3% of all those that take this approach. What little mention they make of race appears in the narrow context of the race and intelligence controversy.

Confusion, too, has representation among the fields. Five texts fall into this category, two

anthropology and three sociology.

Finally, if the biological position is correct--that race fails to achieve construct validity (Diop, 1983; King, 1981; Villars, 1988), only a minority of the texts reviewed make an accurate presentation of race. The six sampled are evenly distributed among the three discipline headings.

In conclusion, answers have been found to the three questions that formed the opening of this discussion of race in the introductory social science curriculum for American undergraduate education. First, as an issue of civic concern, the construction of race does have a place in students' textbooks, if students are to receive preparation for life in contemporary society. Second, within these texts, the authors' level of agreement with the prevailing conception of race held by biologists working in the field of population genetics may stand below 0.5. Finally, the clarity (and, therefore, the accessibility for students) of the presentations of the issue shows a high degree of variability--once again confirming Villar's claim that to do this well is hard work (1988). The implications of these results extend beyond how textbooks are written, however.

Depending on how we in academia construct race, we should see a corresponding impact on how colleges and universities operate. Whether we decide that race has a biological basis or that it is merely an anthropological artifact that has long outlived any utility, we will have to rethink the implications of this understanding for all policies and practices that have been developed to assure a sensitivity to race. These include, but are not limited to, reviews of admissions practices, academic and financial support programs, and the establishment of new disciplines and academic units with missions that have a racial focus. We may, indeed, find this to be hard work.

REFERENCES

American Anthropological Association. (1991, April). Personal communication. Washington, D.C.

American Psychological Association. (1991, April). Personal communication. Washington, D.D.

American Sociological Association. (1991, April). Personal communication. Washington, D.C.

Atkinson, R. L., Atkinson, R. C., Smith, E. E., & Bem, D. J. (1990). Introduction to psychology (10th ed.). San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Bakke wins, quotas lose. (1978, July). Time, pp. 8-12.

Banton, M. (1987). Racial theories. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Bates, D. G., & Plog, F. (1990). Cultural anthropology (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bennett, W. J. (1984). To reclaim a legacy: A report on the humanities in higher education. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper & Row, for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bronstein, P. A., & Quina, K. (1988). Perspectives on gender balance and cultural diversity in the teaching of psychology. In P. A. Bronstein & K. Quina (Eds.), Teaching a psychology of people: Resources for gender and sociocultural awareness (pp. 3-11). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Buskist, W., & Gerbing, D. W. (1990). Psychology: Boundaries and frontiers. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman/Little, Brown Higher Education.

Cornford, F. M. (Trans.) (1945). The republic of Plato. London: Oxford University.

Coser, L. A., Rhea, B., Steffan, P. A., & Noch, S. L. (1983). Introduction to sociology. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Crapo, R. H. (1990). Cultural anthropology: Understanding ourselves & others (2nd ed.). Guilford, CT: Dushkin.

Crooks, R. L., & Stein, J. (1991). Psychology: Science, behavior, and life (2nd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Defunis v. Odegaard, 416 U.S. 312 (1974).

Diop, C. A. (1983). The unity of the origin of the human species. In Racism, science, and pseudo-science: Proceedings of the symposium to examine pseudo-scientific theories invoked to justify racism and racial discrimination, Athens, 30 March to 3 April 1981 (pp. 133-137). Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Dorfman, D. D. (1978). The Cyril Burt questions: New findings. Science, 201, 1177-1186.

Dworetzky, J. P. (1991). Psychology (4th ed.). St. Paul, MN: West.

Ember, C. R., & Ember, M. (1988). Anthropology (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Feldman, R. S. (1990). Understanding psychology (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Heilke, T. W. (1990). Voeglin on the idea of race: An analysis of modern European racism. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University.

Hess, B. B., Markson, E. W., & Stein, P. J. (1991). Sociology (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1987). Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Inciardi, J. A., & Rothman, R. A. (1990) Sociology: Principles and applications. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Jensen, A. R. (1969). How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? Harvard Educational Review, 39, 1-123.

Jurmain, R., Nelson, H., & Turnbaugh, W. A. (1990). Understanding physical anthropology and archeology (4th ed.). St. Paul, MN: West.

Kimball, B. A. (1988) The historical and cultural dimensions of the recent reports. American Journal of Education, 98, pp. 293-322.

King, J. C. (1981). The biology of race (rev. ed.). Berkeley: University of California.

Kottak, C. P. (1991). Cultural anthropology (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lahey, B. B. (1989). Psychology: An introduction. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Larson, R. F., Knapp, R. J., & White, M. F. (1989). Introductory sociology: Order and change in society (4th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Livingston, C. (1991, April 18). Diversity plan hoped to open student minds: Courses should offer insight on multicultural society, future. the daily Collegian, University Park, PA, pp. 1, 11.

Macionis, J. J. (1991). Sociology (rev. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

McNeill, W. H. (1990). A history of the human community, v. I: Prehistory to 1500 (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Moose Lodge No. 107 v. Irvis, 407 U.S. 163 (1972).

National Institute of Education. (1984). Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education, final report of the study group on the conditions of excellence in American higher education. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Ornstein, R., & Carstensen, L. (1991). Psychology: The study of human experience (3rd ed.). San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Peoples, J., & Bailey, G. (1991). Humanity: An introduction to cultural anthropology. St. Paul, MN: West.

Plato. (1960). Apology: Socrates at his trial. In B. Jowett (trans.), The republic and other works. Garden City, NY: Dolphin.

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978).

Roediger, H. L., III, Capaldi, E. D., Paris, S. G., & Polivy, J. (1991). Psychology (3rd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Schultz, E. A., & Lavenda, R. H. (1990). Cultural anthropology: A perspective on the human condition (2nd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West.

Sdorow, L. (1990). Psychology. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Stark, R. (1987). Sociology (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Stocking, G. W., Jr. (1982). Anthropology in crisis? A view from between the generations. In E. A. Hoebel, R. Currier, & S. Kaiser (Eds.), Crisis in anthropology: Views from Spring Hill, 1980 (pp. 407-417). New York: Garland.

Theodorson, G., & Theodorson, L. (1990). Sociology: Principles and applications. St. Paul, MN: West.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000(d) et seq.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000(e) et seq.

U. S. Constitution. Amend. XV, sec. 1.

U. S. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. (1969). Report. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Vander Zanden, J. W. (1990). Sociology: The core (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Villars, T. A. (1988). Psychobiology. In P. A. Bronstein & K. Quina (Eds.), Teaching a psychology of people: Resources for gender and sociocultural awareness (pp. 80-87). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Wallace, P. M., Goldstein, J. H., & Nathan, P. E. (1990). Introduction to psychology (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Wallace, R. C., & Wallace, W. D. (1989). Sociology (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Weingart, P. (1989). German eugenics between science and politics. Osiris (2nd series), 5, pp. 260-282.

Weiten, W. (1989). Psychology: Themes and variations. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Wortman, C. B., Loftus, E. F., & Marshall, M. E. (1988). Psychology (3rd ed.). New York: Knopf.

Table.

Distribution of Textbooks by Discipline

Among Categories of the Organizational Scheme

	Disciplines			
	Anthropology	Psychology	Sociology	Total
Categories				
Ignores	2	10	—	12
Confused	2	--	3	5
Bio Model	--	--	3	3
Soc Model	3	2	3	8

Chi-square = 20.078, $p < .05$.